Poor House.

46. **Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.**—In the answer to question No. 180 of the Legislative Session of 1103, will the Government be pleased to state:—

(1) whether the building said to have been constructed in a (2) of the question is the Poor House ;

(2) who was the officer who visited this building used as hostel and what is his report ;

(3) has the Government looked into the title deed of the site referred to in (a) (1) of the answer ; if not, will the Government call for a copy of the title deed from the party or from the Kunnamkulam Registry Office and place it on the Table of the House ?

Rao Sahib Mr. C. Matthai.—(1) Yes.

(2) The building was visited by the Diwan and the Director of Public Instruction. There has been no official report.

(3) No ; in view of the copy of the letter of the Honorary Secretary which is appended, Government do not consider it necessary to call for the title deed. (*Vide Appendix I.*)

Contract with Mr. Namberumal Chettiar.

47. **Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.**—Will the Government be pleased to place on the Table of the House a copy of the agreement dated 3rd February 1912 with Mr. Namberumal Chettiar, contractor, Madras, for the delivery of 60,000 candies of teak by the Government at Trichur Saw Mill and to state:—

2. (a) what were the actual expenses incurred by the Government to fell, collect and deliver the said quantity of timber ; and

(b) what was the amount realised under the agreement ?

Mr. K. Govinda Menon.—A copy of the agreement is placed on the Council Table.

2. (a) Timber to Mr. T. Namberumal Chetty was supplied from the Chalakkudi Depot out of the stock that arrived from the hills. During the currency of this contract, there were other sales also from the Chalakkudi Depot. As the registers of the Chalakkudi Depot got damaged in the floods of 1099, it is not possible to accurately find out which all coupe logs of O. W. C. were supplied to Mr. T. Namberumal Chetty. Without knowing this, it is not possible to find out the exact expenditure incurred.

(b) The amount realised was Rs. 11,85,000.

Nominated Member of a Village Panchayat.

48. **Mr. C. A. Kunjunni Raja.**—Will the Government be pleased to state;—

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

tion is better than cure. Because of that prevention, there need not have been cases before.

Mr. K. P. Kannan Nayar.—With reference to the answer to (e), I think it is one rupee for 100 rupees. Then with reference to (j), for the stamp vendors to earn one rupee, they have to put down the serial number of the papers, and note down the name of the person to whom such papers are vended on the back of 800 papers. The practice is unheard of.

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—That is the practice, and that is the rule.

Mr. K. P. Kannan Nayar.—So also in the court-fee labels ?

Rao Sahib Mr. T. V. Kasturi Ranga Ayyar.—With regard to court-fee labels, the name of the vendor and the date only are necessary. Article 44 which deals with court-fee labels lays down: "*On all adhesive stamp sold, the vendor should sign his name and enter the date*". That is the rule.

APPENDIX I.

(*Vide Answer to Question No. 46.*)

Letter dated 30th December 1927 from the Honorary Secretary, Young Womens' Christian Association, Kunnamkulam.

"With reference to your letter of the 1st November I have to inform you that the Seva Mandiram is under the control and management of the Y. W. C. A. and is a part of its work. It is built therefore on the Y. W. C. A. land purchased for the Association work. Land was purchased for the Association before the Government contributed Rs. 500 and subsequently to the Government contribution also land has been purchased. The Seva Mandir building is constructed on a piece of land purchased before the Government contributed Rs. 500. Please note that the Government contribution was not for the hostel but for purchasing land for the Association purpose, and that the main purpose of the Seva Mandir is to give habitation to women and children, which naturally comes under the scope of the Association work.

I was away from Kunnamkulam and that has been the reason for the delay in replying you".

APPENDIX

(*Vide Answer to Question No. 50.*)

"The diversion of the Manali river is a part of what has been called the Karuvannur Scheme. In this Scheme two different alignments for the diversion of the Manali river were surveyed. The first of these is at a place near Veembu. This involves very deep cutting and hence the cost of diversion will be prohibitive. This is, however, abandoned. The second is at a place called Marathakara. This proposed channel will pass through the existing cutting near the Padavaratt temple and empty itself into the Puncha lands beyond the Railway line near Ollur. A diversion from the Karuvannur river at a place between Palakkadavu and Arattupuzha is also being investigated. This goes through Pallisseri Kayal to the Kole lands near Muthulliyal. This proposal and the Marathakara diversion of the water seem to be feasible.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly